

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application, claim 20 having been added herein. The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

The examiner has required that Fig. 1 be designated with the legend "PRIOR ART". The replacement drawing is attached. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-9 were objected to as being in improper multiply dependent form. Claim 5 has been amended to depend only from claim 1. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 was objected to because the examiner believes that the limitation in line 4 "plurality of components" was intended to be "plurality of commands". Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 10 is written as was intended. Thus, claim 10 recites a plurality of components on line 4 and a plurality of commands on line 6. If this

objection is maintained, the examiner is requested to explain his contention more completely.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, due to the inclusion of the trademark. Claim 4 has been amended to withdraw the trademark and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, due to a lack of proper antecedent basis for the term "for each field". Claim 16 has been amended to correct this informality. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 10 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tarpey, EPO 0701202A1. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over Tarpey. These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a method for automatically generating an interface software program for entering a plurality of commands for operating a complex system by a user, wherein the complex system is equipment for a telecommunication network, the complex system featuring a

plurality of components each supporting a sub-plurality of the commands. The method includes: (a) providing a component interface for each of the plurality of components, the component interface including a command description of each of the corresponding sub-plurality of commands, including a description of each parameter for each command; (b) parsing the command description from said component interface to form a description of a command interface for each command for display to the user; (c) building the command interface for each command; and (d) creating the interface software program for displaying the command interface for each command to the user. This is taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

Tarpey describes that a graphical front end (GUI) can be added to any UNIX command (or shell script) to handle parameter input (see Tarpey's Claim 1 and lines 36-39 of page 2). It is used for activation of UNIX commands which are "user non-friendly". Tarpey does not mention a plurality of components for which the mentioned actions are performed. Thus, no relationship is defined/described between commands and components, parameters and components, etc. in Tarpey.

The claimed invention sets a different task. In particular, the claimed invention describes a method of automatically generating an interface software program for

displaying the command interface for each command to a user (actually, the subject of the invention is automatic generation of a GUI program). Actually, the method enables a set of interfaces to be automatically created as a GUI system for operating a complex system comprising a plurality of component, such as a digital cross-connect for telecommunication networks (see page 15, lines 11-15).

Though applicant respectfully submits that to advance prosecution Claim 1 differs from the cited solution, applicant proposes to emphasize the difference by amending Claim 1, i.e., to limit the complex system as equipment of a telecommunication network. This claimed combination is not taught in the cited art.

Claim 8 of the present invention discloses providing a list of excluded values for each parameter. Tarpey does not disclose such a feature. Upon amendment of Claim 5, Claim 8 now has proper dependency and can be examined on the merits.

Claim 9 of the present application also has proper dependency now and can be examined on the merits. It is new/non-obvious at least as depending on Claim 8.

Claim 10 was incorrectly understood by the Examiner (see section 3 of the office Action and section 3 of this letter). Claim 10 continues disclosure of the method for

building GUI with some "non-uniform" or "non-modular" components (component interfaces), which was started in Claim 2. Claim 2 relates to the case where some components (network elements) exist, which allow specific commands not corresponding to the sub-plurality of commands supported by most of the components of the system. Claim 2 describes what should be done with such non-suitable components (i.e., the sub-plurality of the components). For each of such "non-corresponding" command a description is to be provided, and then a relationship must be provided with each of the "non-suitable" components. Claim 10 additionally clarifies how such "non-suitable" components can be integrated in the GUI from the point of operations: for each operation allowed with any component of the system, the method determines relationship between such an operation and each of the whole plurality of commands.

The text portion cited by the Examiner with respect to Claim 10 is therefore inapplicable. Therefore, Claim 10 is new in view of Tarpey.

Claim 11 is criticized by the Examiner from the point of applying general security measures before accessing a software system or a station (Tarpey speaks about accessing or "login to" remote machines).

Claim 11 speaks about security of access required before accessing a particular command. The claimed access security is not a regular access security, it is much more specific and flexible since is performed at a command level. Claim 11 is therefore novel in view of the cited reference.

Applicant wishes to introduce a new claim supported by the description and explicitly disclosing an important and advantageous feature of the inventive method.

As has been mentioned above, Claim 2 of the present application relates to the situation when not all the components (such as network elements as specified in Claim 3) but only part of them run commands supported by all components of this part (i.e., sub-plurality of commands). See in this connection page 5, line 23 to page 6, line 12. In other words, only that part of the components can be described by a common command file. Claim 2 indirectly proposes what can be done with a sub-plurality of components which support commands that are not defined as belonging to the sub-plurality of commands.

The description discloses an option enabling easy connection, to the GUI interface, of an additional network element (component) which runs unique commands and thus is not suitable to other network elements (components) described by a common command file. According to the invention, such

original commands can be easily added to the common plurality of commands (page 9, lines 11-18):

"There is, of course, yet another and most practical option which constitutes a combination of the two above versions and comprises partially building the GUI system with respect to a part of the components from their component interfaces if readily available and suitable, and thereupon completing the GUI system by determining the command description for each command and the relationship between commands and components with respect to the remaining components."

In the amended set of claims, new dependent Claim 20 explicitly claims the above-described option. This feature is not taught in the cited art.

For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-20 are patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

Appln. No. 09/889,627  
Amd. dated October 13, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 15, 2004

If the examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 628-5197.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By   
Ronni S. Jillions  
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:jec  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\E\eci\Rozenberg1\PTO\AMD 13 OCT 04.doc

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The examiner has required that Fig. 1 be designated with the legend "PRIOR ART". Attached is a replacement drawing which designates the legend "PRIOR ART" in Fig. 1.